



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 18, 2005

Ms. Judith Sachitano Rawls
Assistant City Attorney
Beaumont Police Department
P.O. Box 3827
Beaumont, TX 77704-3827

OR2005-03290

Dear Ms. Rawls:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 222247.

The Beaumont Police Department (the "department") received a request for a specific police report and related records, including the policy and procedure for seizure of money. You state that you have released most of the information to the requestor, but you claim that the Written Directive on the Seizure of Money is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You raise section 552.108 of the Government Code to withhold the submitted information.¹ An internal record of a law enforcement agency maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution may be withheld under section 552.108(b)(1) if it is demonstrated that "release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution." See *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet. h.) (section 552.108(b)(1) protects information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state

¹ Although you make your arguments to withhold the information at issue under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code, we note that section 552.108(b)(1) is the more appropriate exception in this instance.

laws); Open Records Decision No. 636 at 2-3 (1995). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) protected information that would reveal law enforcement techniques. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would interfere with law enforcement), 456 (1987) (release in advance of information regarding location of off-duty police officers would interfere with law enforcement), 413 (1984) (release of sketch showing security measures to be used at next execution would interfere with law enforcement), 409 (1984) (information regarding certain burglaries protected if it exhibits pattern that reveals investigative techniques), 341 (1982) (release of certain information from DPS would interfere with law enforcement because disclosure would hamper departmental efforts to detect forgeries of drivers' licenses), 252 (1980) (statutory predecessor was designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). The predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) was not applicable to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (1989) (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). A governmental body that relies on section 552.108(b)(1) must sufficiently explain how and why the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 531 at 2 (1989); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 434 at 2 (1986) (circumstances of each case must be examined to determine whether release of particular information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention), 409 at 2 (1984) (whether disclosure of particular records will interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention must be decided on case-by-case basis).

You state that disclosure of the submitted information "would compromise the security of the department by disclosing procedures as to the handling and submission of money obtained by officers and securing, depositing, and distribution of the money." After reviewing the information at issue, we find that the city may withhold a portion of the submitted information, which we have marked, under section 552.108(b)(1), as the release of this information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. For the remaining information, we find that you have not demonstrated how release of this information would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, the remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the

governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Michael A. Pearle
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MAP/jh

Ref: ID#222247

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Anthony B. Harris
3104 Garrison Avenue, SW
Birmingham, Alabama 35211
(w/o enclosures)